

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 54-87 were pending and rejected. In this response, no claim has been canceled. Claims 54, 58, 61-68, 71, 75, 78-85 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim, in full, clear, concise, and exact terms, the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. The amended claims are fully supported by the specification. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 54, 61-68, 71 and 78-85 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claims 54 and 71 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections have been overcome.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 54-62, 69-79, 86 and 87 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,115,715 to Traversat, et al. ("Traversat '715") and U.S. Patent No. 6,119,129 to Traversat, et al. ("Traversat '129"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,714 to Blumenau, et al. ("Blumenau"). Claims 63-68 and 80-85 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat '715 and Blumenau as applied to claims 62 and 79 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0065795 of Asherman ("Asherman"). In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 54-87 as amended include limitations that are not disclosed by the cite references.

Specifically, for example, independent claim 54 requires receiving from a plurality of CLI interfaces of a network element. In response, a session thread is created for each CLI transaction. For each CLI operation of the CLI transaction, a component manager associated with the respective CLI operation processes the CLI operation into one or more database operations that will be performed within a database being accessed. The database operations are stored in a transaction log without accessing the database, until a commit command is received from a user via the CLI and the associated session thread.

That is, although all of the database operations are identified based on the CLI transaction, such database operations are not committed to the database. Rather, such database operations are stored in the transaction log, until a commit command is received from the user. Once the commit command is received from the user specifically indicating that the user commits to the database operations, the database operations are transmitted to the database for operations. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from the cited references, individually or in combination.

Although the Traversat '129 patent discloses a journal, such a journal is not the same as the transaction log as recited in claim 54. Rather, such a journal is for tracking the status of the database operations while the database operations are being performed (see, e.g., the Traversat '129 patent, Abstract; col.2, lines 5-9 and 57-60).

Specifically, referring to Fig. 7 of the Traversat '129 patent, although at block 706 the database has not been accessed; however, at block 708, the database is accessed, and then a "commit" entry is inserted into the journal at block 716. That is, the "commit" status is inserted into the journal after the database access has completed (see, e.g., the Traversat '129 patent, Fig. 7; col. 9, lines 1-49).

In contrast, the present invention as claimed requires that no database access is

performed until a commit command is received from the user, which is completely teaches away from the Traversat '129 patent. In addition, it appears that the term of "commit of the Traversat '129 patent is merely a status entered into the journal, rather than a command specifically issued by a user. It is respectfully submitted that other cited references, individually or in combination, also fail to disclose or suggest the limitations set forth above.

In order to render a claim obvious, each and every limitations of the claim must be taught by the cited references. It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references, individually or in combination, teaches or suggests the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 54 is patentable over the cited references.

Similarly, independent claim 71 includes limitations similar to those cited in claim 54. Thus, for the reasons similar to those set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 71 is patentable over the cited references. Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: July 10, 2006



Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095
Kevin_Shao@bstz.com

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300